1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9		
10	DEREK STENSON,	CASE NO. C23-1316 MJP
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER
12	v.	
13	KING COUNTY, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16	This matter comes before the Court on the Parties' Stipulated Protective Order. (Dkt. No.	
17	13.) Having reviewed the Order and all supporting materials, the Court DENIES entry of the	
18	Order without prejudice.	
19	The Court appreciates that the Parties have submitted a proposed protective order that	
20	largely tracks the District's Model Protective Order. But the Parties propose an overbroad and	
21	vague definition of "confidential material" to include "[a]ny other material enjoying special legal	
22	protection from disclosure that is relevant to the claims or defenses in this case." As the Model	
23	Protective Order instructs, the Parties "must include	e a list of specific documents such as
24		

1	'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;" and may not "list broad categories of		
2	documents such as "sensitive business material." Model Stipulated Protective Order at 2,		
3	available at		
4	https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/ModelStipulatedProtectiveOrder.pdf. The		
5	Court will consider a more specific and narrow definition of "confidential material" that tracks		
6	the Model Protective Order and identifies specific documents, rather than an open-ended and		
7	overbroad category of documents.		
8	The Court also rejects the Parties' proposed "Acknowledgment." The Parties have		
9	revised and altered the language of the "Acknowledgment" from the Model Protective Order in		
10	material ways that do not appear to be either necessary or prudent. Without some explanation as		
11	to why the proposed revisions are necessary, the Court rejects this deviation from the Model		
12	Protective Order. The Court will consider a revised "Acknowledgment" that mirrors the one		
13	included in the Model Protective Order.		
14	For these two reasons, the Court DENIES the Order without prejudice. The Court will		
15	consider entry of a revised Stipulated Protective Order that addresses the Court's concerns set		
16	forth in this Order.		
17	The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.		
18	Dated November 13, 2023.		
19	Maesley Velens		
20	Marsha J. Pechman United States Senior District Judge		
21			
22			
23			
24			